# CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

**Project Name:** 

Road Access Easement

**Proposed** 

Implementation Date:

April 2015

Proponent:

Clark Hoffpauer Chad Hertchins

Location:

SE4NE4 Section 36 Township 4N Range 2E

County:

Gallatin County

Trust:

Common Schools

#### I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Right of Way Easement application for a driveway that allows for access to the back of the residence.

#### II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

# 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Grazing lessee

# 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

None

## 3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Action: Process the application for Right of Way Easement.

No Action: Do not process the application for Right of Way Easement.

#### III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

# 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

Soils are Brocko Silt Loam, located on flat terrain.

Action Alternative: A driveway of about 100 feet will cross the property on flat ground, no adverse effects would be expected.

No Action Alternative: Native range would remain unchanged.

### 5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

There is no water on the site, nor would site drainage contribute to a water source.

#### 6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Native range and a yard scape are the existing condition.

Action Alternative: A driveway of about 100 feet will cross the property on flat ground. A native surface driveway under dry conditions dust would be produced when used, but due to the scope of the proposal no adverse effects would be expected.

No Action Alternative: Native range would remain unchanged.

# 7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

Native range and a yard scape are the existing condition.

Action Alternative: A driveway of about 100 feet will cross the property on flat ground. A native surface driveway will eliminate a small amount of vegetation, but due to the scope of the proposal no adverse effects would be expected.

No Action Alternative: Native range would remain unchanged

## 8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

Native range and a yard scape are the existing condition.

Action Alternative: A driveway of about 100 feet will cross the property on flat ground. Due to the scope of the proposal no adverse effects would be expected.

No Action Alternative: Native range would remain unchanged

# 9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

The Black Tailed Prairie Dog is listed as a species of concern by the Montana Natural Heritage program.

No effect would be expected with either alternative.

# 10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

No historical and/or archaeological sites have been identified.

#### 11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

Native range and a yard scape are the existing condition.

Action Alternative: A driveway of about 100 feet will cross the property on flat ground. Due to the scope of the proposal no adverse effects would be expected.

No Action Alternative: Native range would remain unchanged

# 12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

Neither alternative would require resources.

## 13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

None.

# IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

#### 14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

No effect under either alternative.

# 15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

No effect under either alternative

## 16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

No effect under either alternative.

### 17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

No effect under either alternative.

## 18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

No effect under either alternative.

#### 19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

None.

#### 20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

No effect under either alternative.

# 21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

No effect under either alternative.

identity potential d	TURES A	ND MORES:	
No effect under eithe		native or traditional lifestyles or c ve.	rommunities.
23. CULTURAL UNI	QUENES:	S AND DIVERSITY:	
		ny unique quality of the area?	
No effect under eithe	r alternativ	'e.	
Estimate the return	to the trust	OCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIR t. Include appropriate economic a gement. Identify cumulative econo	CUMSTANCES: nalysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis omic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the
The determined value encumbrance returnir	e for an eas ng \$494.65	sement on this parcel would book to the permanent fund.	e \$2,132.15 per acre for 0.232 acres of
EA Checklist	Name:	Craig Campbell	<b>Date:</b> 3/24/15
Prepared By:	Title:	Bozeman Unit Manager	
And the second s			
		V. FINDIN	G
25. ALTERNATIVE S	FLECTE	).	
Action: Process the ap	oplication f	for Right of Way Easement.	
according to the chief	t none of this outlined or from the constant of the consider the consideration that the considera	he anticipated environmental in ARM 36.2.524. If ind that equent. Further, I find that the dered unique or fragile, will not	impacts outlined in the EA are significant no impacts are regarded as severe, enduring, quantity and quality of various resources,
ind no precedent for f or Federal laws, requir	uture actio rements, o	ons that would cause significar or formal plans. In summary 1 t	t be adversely affected to a significant degree. I not impacts, and I find no conflict with local, State, find that the identified adverse impacts will be the extent that the impacts are not significant.
including any that may ind no precedent for f or Federal laws, requin avoided, controlled, or	uture actio rements, o mitigated	ons that would cause significar or formal plans. In summary 1 t	nt impacts, and I find no conflict with local, State,
including any that may ind no precedent for f or Federal laws, requin avoided, controlled, or	uture actio rements, o mitigated	ons that would cause significar or formal plans. In summary, I the broject to	nt impacts, and I find no conflict with local, State,
ind no precedent for for Federal laws, required avoided, controlled, or T. NEED FOR FURT	uture actio rements, o mitigated	ons that would cause significar formal plans. In summary, I to by the design of the project to IRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:	nt impacts, and I find no conflict with local, State, find that the identified adverse impacts will be the extent that the impacts are not significant.
ind no precedent for for Federal laws, require avoided, controlled, or T. NEED FOR FURT	rements, o mitigated	IRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:  More Detailed EA	int impacts, and I find no conflict with local, State, find that the identified adverse impacts will be the extent that the impacts are not significant.  X No Further Analysis
cluding any that may and no precedent for for Federal laws, required in the record of	HER ENV	IRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:  More Detailed EA  Katie Svoboda  Bozeman Unit Office Mana	nt impacts, and I find no conflict with local, State, find that the identified adverse impacts will be the extent that the impacts are not significant.  X No Further Analysis